

# NEW JERSEY MILITIA NEWSLETTER

Volume XIII, Issue No. 8

February 2008

*All persons are by nature free and independent, and have certain natural and unalienable rights, among which are those of enjoying and defending life and liberty, of acquiring, possessing, and protecting property, and of pursuing and obtaining safety and happiness.*

-- Article 1, Section 1, New Jersey State Constitution

## An About-Face on Guns

By Christopher Orlet

Few Americans are aware that they are members of a militia, that is, the so-called "unorganized" militia. However, the Militia Act of 1903 – which revived the militia system in the wake of the Spanish-American War – states that every able-bodied male citizen between the ages of 17 and 44 is by definition a member of the unorganized militia. If you are an able-bodied male, you are likely a member of your state militia, too. (For example, the Virginia unorganized militia is made up of males 16-55.) But whether an unorganized militia is the same as a well-regulated militia has been a matter of intense debate. In *Parker vs. District of Columbia* (March, 2007) the Supreme Court noted that "Congress provided that a large portion of the militia would remain unorganized" and that even an unorganized militia can be well regulated.

Specifically, militias are typically made up of two parts: the organized militia (such as the National Guard and the National Guard Reserve), and the unorganized militia. For the American colonists, the militia was the first line of defense against hostile Indian tribes and the invading British troops.

But why a militia? To say that historically Britons and Americans have been distrustful of standing armies would be an understatement. Until the 18<sup>th</sup> century, English kings often used standing armies as their personal troops. But as the monarchy's power waned following the Glorious Revolution, Parliament eliminated the authority of the king to keep standing armies in peacetime. One hundred years before Congress approved the U.S. Bill of Rights, the English Bill of Rights of 1689 guaranteed British

subjects (including those in the American colonies) the following:

"That the raising or keeping a standing army within the kingdom in time of peace, unless it be with consent of Parliament, is against law;

"That the subjects which are Protestants may have arms for their defence suitable to their conditions as allowed by law."

Indeed, one of the most significant grievances of the colonists was the king's standing armies, which often tried – unsuccessfully – to disarm them. After the American Revolution, the militia remained an important part of the nation's defense. In 1808, Thomas Jefferson said:

"For a people who are free, and who mean to remain so, a well-organized and armed militia is their best security. It is, therefore, incumbent on us at every meeting to revise the condition of the militia, and to ask ourselves if it is prepared to repel a powerful enemy at every point of our territories exposed to invasion."

Today's gun control advocates argue that militias have been replaced by standing armies, thus the Second Amendment is obsolete, and must be interpreted as being so. And since the Second Amendment merely protects state's rights to form armed militias, there is no individual right to bear arms. Indeed, in a 1991 interview former Chief Justice Warren Burger called the individual rights view "one of the greatest pieces of fraud – I repeat the word 'fraud' – on the American public by special interest groups that I have ever seen in my lifetime."

In the *Parker* decision, the court found a right to bear arms separate from the militia, noting that the right to bear arms "was premised on the private use of arms for activities such as

hunting and self-defense, the latter being understood as resistance to either private depredations of a tyrannical government (or a threat from abroad)." As for the militia, the court noted too, "[T]he right to keep and bear arms had the important and salutary civic purpose of helping to preserve the citizen militia."

It's a complicated historical issue that will come before the U.S. Supreme Court. It is important that Americans understand the historical aspects surrounding the debate, and not rely solely on the empty wind of politicians' sound bites.

-- *America's 1<sup>st</sup> Freedom*, August 2007

## Bad Brief

By John R. Lott Jr.

A lot of Americans who believe in the right to own guns were very disappointed this weekend, when the Bush administration's Justice Department filed a brief to the Supreme Court that effectively supports the District of Columbia's 1976 handgun ban. The administration pays lip service to the notion that the Second Amendment protects gun ownership as an "individual right," but their brief leaves the term essentially meaningless.

Alan Gura, the attorney who will be representing those challenging the ban, accused the Bush administration of "basically siding with the District of Columbia."

The Department of Justice argument can be boiled down pretty easily. Its lawyers claim that since the government bans machine guns, it should also be able to ban handguns. After all, they reason, people can still own rifles and shotguns for protection, even if they have to be stored locked up. The DOJ even seems to accept that trigger locks are not really that much of a burden, and that the locks "can

properly be interpreted" as not interfering with using guns for self-protection. Yet, even if gun locks do interfere with self-defense, DOJ believes the regulations should be allowed, as long as the District of Columbia government thinks it has a good reason.

Factually, there are many mistakes in the DOJ's reasoning: As soon as a rifle or shotgun is unlocked, it becomes illegal in D.C., and there has never been a federal ban on machine guns. But these are relatively minor points. Nor does it really matter that the only academic research on the impact of trigger locks on crime finds that states that require guns be locked up and unloaded face a five-percent increase in murder and a 12 percent increase in rape. Since the potential of armed victims deters criminals, storing a gun locked and unloaded actually encourages crime.

The biggest problem is the standard used for evaluating the constitutionality of regulations. The DOJ is asking that a different, much weaker standard be used for the Second Amendment than the courts demands for other "individual rights" such as speech.

The DOJ brief argues that if the DC government says gun control is important for public safety, it should be allowed by the courts. Perhaps the Justice Department's position isn't too surprising. Like any other government agency, it has a hard time giving up its authority. The Justice Department's bias can be seen in that it finds it necessary to raise the specter of machine guns 10 times when evaluating a law that bans handguns. Nor does the brief even acknowledge that after the ban, D.C.'s murder rate only [once](#) fell below what it was in 1976. Worried about the possibility that a Supreme Court decision supporting the Second Amendment as an individual right could "cast doubt on the constitutionality of existing federal legislation," the Department of Justice felt it necessary to head off any restrictions on government power right at the beginning. -- Jan. 14, 2008

### **DC: 2nd Amendment Doesn't Apply Here**

The District of Columbia is seeking to preserve its three-decade ban on handgun possession

The U.S. Supreme Court agreed to take the case, setting up what could be a landmark ruling on the scope of the Second Amendment. The court has not addressed the issue in a significant way for nearly 70 years.

Former U.S. Solicitor General Walter Dellinger is the lead attorney representing the district.

-- AP Jan. 4, 2008

Ed.: So a former Solicitor General, a person sworn to defend the Constitution -- but meanwhile arguing for the federal government in its unconstitutional power grabs in Supreme Court cases -- continues his forsworn ways by representing another government as it makes its own unconstitutional arguments before the Supreme Court. Interesting, no?

### **Jersey Supreme Censured**

In a 5-0 decision the N.J. Supreme Court censured Justice Roberto Rivera-Soto for intervening in a dispute between his son and a high school football teammate.

Angered that the school declined to take disciplinary action, Rivera-Soto pursued a delinquency complaint against his son's teammate. He identified himself as a justice to the chief of police, prosecutor and judges overseeing the case, thereby violating judicial standards by "engaging in a course of conduct that created a risk that the prestige and power of his judicial office might influence and advance a private matter."

-- theLegalReformer, July-Sept. 2007

Ed.: Guys, what say you? Does Rivera-Soto have the makings of a U.S. Solicitor General or what. (See article above.)

### **Something to offend everyone**

Why is divorce so expensive? Because it's worth it.

What's the fastest way to a man's heart? Through his chest with a sharp knife.

Why is it so hard to find men who are sensitive, caring and good looking? Those men already have boyfriends.

What's the difference between a new husband and a new dog? After a year the dog is still excited to see you.

Why does Mike Tyson cry during sex? Mace will do that to you.

Why did O.J. Simpson want to move to West Virginia? Everyone has the same DNA.

Why do drivers' ed classes in redneck schools use the car only on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays? Because on Tuesdays and Thursdays the sex ed class uses it.

What did the Chinese couple name their blond baby? Sum Ting Wong

What's the difference between northern and southern zoos? A southern

zoo has a description of the animal plus a recipe.

### **Boxer vs. the Council on American-Islamic Relations**

Despite being founded by two self-identified supporters of Islamic terrorism and continually refusing to condemn Islamic terrorism, the Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR) has not only survived, but thrived. In the five years since 9/11, CAIR has grown exponentially in both resources and influence, becoming the de facto voice of American Muslims in the mainstream media. It has been embraced by many sectors of the federal government, including the FBI. But politically, CAIR's success primarily has been limited to forging alliances with leftist organizations, most notably the ACLU.

Though the long-term implications are still far from certain Sen. Barbara Boxer's recent recall of a "certificate of accomplishment" award given to [Basim Elkarra head of the Sacramento CAIR chapter] her very public disavowal of CAIR might encourage real media investigation by changing the perception that criticism of CAIR is a right-wing affair, and it could even inspire other Democrats and liberals to follow her lead.

CAIR claims that Boxer succumbed to the "pro-Israel lobby," who are "anti-Muslim extremists." Calls to her office were overwhelming against her decision, and only one group, California-based Stand With Us, actually encouraged its members to support her. But ironically, in the course of disparaging Ms. Boxer, CAIR demonstrated precisely why the Senator did the right thing.

Interviewed by Paula Zahn last week on CNN, CAIR spokesman Ibrahim Hooper let loose a grandiose fabrication: "We practically have a rubber stamp saying, 'CAIR condemns blank act of terrorism.' We've repeatedly, consistently condemned terrorism in all its forms, including attacks on Israeli civilians by Hamas, Hezbollah. We've condemned it repeatedly."

Not true.

CAIR has, in fact, never condemned Hamas or Hezbollah. Given repeated opportunities to do so by outlets such as the *Washington Post* and the *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, CAIR has flatly refused to denounce either. Asked point-blank by *Newsweek* just last month to condemn Hamas, CAIR Executive Director (and co-founder) Nihad Awad demurred, dismissing the

*In the beginning of change the patriot is a scarce man, brave, hated and scorned. When his cause succeeds, however, the timid join him, for then it costs nothing to be a patriot. -- Mark Twain*

question as "the game of the pro-Israel lobby."

Both of CAIR's co-founders have freely discussed Islamic terrorism—by voicing their support. In a speech at Barry University in Florida in 1994, Mr. Awad declared, "I'm in support of the Hamas movement." Addressing a youth session at a 1999 Islamic Association for Palestine convention in Chicago, CAIR's other co-founder, Omar Ahmad, praised suicide bombers who "kill themselves for Islam": "Fighting for freedom, fighting for Islam, that is not suicide. They kill themselves for Islam." (Transcript provided by the Investigative Project.)

Attacks on CAIR, however, require some degree of nuance, as the group doesn't openly advocate on behalf of Islamic terrorist organizations. Though it has fiercely and loudly defended men charged with aiding terrorism, such as now-open Hamas operative Mousa Abu Marzouk and former University of South Florida professor Sami al-Arian, CAIR's primary focus is stifling legitimate debate on the threat posed by radical Islam. Talk radio host Michael Graham was drummed out of Disney-owned WMAL in Washington because of a campaign spearheaded by the group. More recently, talk host and columnist Dennis Prager was publicly flagellated for criticizing new Congressman Keith Ellison's decision to swear his oath of office on the Qur'an.

That its apologism for Islamic terrorism has been remarkably slick is probably why CAIR has thus far escaped scrutiny by the left or the mainstream media. Perhaps the best example is its much-ballyhooed fatwa against terrorism and extremism—terms that intentionally were not defined. No fundamentalist Muslim considers himself "extreme," and Hamas and its boosters maintain that the only real "terrorist" in the region is the Jewish state. Not coincidentally, CAIR claims to condemn "all forms of terrorism," yet it almost exclusively focuses on Israel's actions.

Seeing through CAIR's tapestry of lies and deceptions is admittedly a tough task, but by no means an impossible one. Sen. Boxer did it with little outside prodding from a Front Page Magazine article by Joe Kaufman. How many others in the media and on the left will follow suit? -- FrontPageMagazine.com, Jan. 17, 2007

## "We want to offer sharia law to Britain"

Dr Suhaib Hasan, a silver-bearded sheikh and a spokesman for the Muslim Council of Britain on issues of sharia law, says there is great misunderstanding of the issue in the West.

"Whenever people associate the word 'sharia' with Muslims, they think it is flogging and stoning to death and cutting off the hand," he says with a smile.

He makes the distinction between the aspects of law that sharia covers: worship, penal law, and personal law. Muslim leaders in Britain are interested only in integrating personal law, he says.

Despite this, Dr Hasan is open in supporting the severe punishments meted out in countries where sharia law governs the country. "Even though cutting off the hands and feet, or flogging the drunkard and fornicator, seem to be very abhorrent, once they are implemented, they become a deterrent for the whole society."

"This is why in Saudi Arabia, for example, where these measures are implemented, the crime rate is very, very, low," he told *The Sunday Telegraph*.

In a documentary to be screened on Channel 4 Dr Hasan goes further, advocating a sharia system for Britain. "If sharia law is implemented, then you can turn this country into a haven of peace because once a thief's hand is cut off nobody is going to steal," he says.

"Once, just only once, if an adulterer is stoned nobody is going to commit this crime at all."

"We want to offer it to the British society. If they accept it, it is for their good and if they don't accept it they'll need more and more prisons."

These sentiments, and the vast cultural gulf they expose, alarm many in the West and go to the heart of the debate about the level of integration among Muslims living in Britain and their acceptance of British values.

"The introduction of sharia law in Britain raises complex questions, as some of its basic tenets are incompatible with the fundamental principles of our liberal democracy and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights," says Baroness Cox, a leading human rights campaigner.

"There is no equality before the law between men and women and between Muslims and non-Muslims;

and there is no freedom to choose and change religion."

Critics warn that in giving even parts of sharia law official status, Britain would be associating itself with a system that in many ways was intolerable according to Western values.

Professor John Marks, author of *The West, Islam and Islamism*, points out that apostates from Islam can suffer severe punishment, even honour killings.

A survey by Policy Exchange found that 36 per cent of young British Muslims believed that a Muslim who converted to another religion should be "punished by death". -- London *Telegraph* Jan 21, 2008

## "Islamic Values"

KUALA LUMPUR, Malaysia - Kelantan, Malaysia's only state run by the Islamic opposition party, will get stricter about enforcing separate lines for men and women at supermarket checkout counters.

The Islamic opposition party, which has ruled Kelantan for more than 17 years, imposed the separate lineup rule as part of its agenda to promote Islamic values. In recent years, however, people ignored the regulation, and there was little enforcement.

-- AP, Jan. 22, 2008

Ed.: Islamic values, of course, are based on sharia law!

## The Koran, Peace and Democracy

Although the Koran is known to propose a peaceful lifestyle, there are many Muslims who have over the centuries sought to interpret the scripture for the sake of war. "Those warlike verses, sometimes referred to as the 'sword verses', call for killing unbelievers: 'When the sacred months have passed, slay the idolaters wherever you find them, and take them, and confine them, and lie in wait for them at every place of ambush' (Koran, sura 9:5). This is one of a number of Qur'anic [Koranic] verses that are cited by critics to demonstrate the inherently violent nature of Islam and its scripture."

<http://peacejournalism.com:80/ReadArticle.asp?ArticleID=20734>

The one commonality of Islam is the following of the Koran, but it becomes obvious that the system of leadership proposed by Islamic law is autocratic theocracy. Without the abandonment of Sharia for the sake of public law there could be little or no

interest in a democracy like those of the western world.

### **"Human Rights", Canadian Style**

Allow us to offer Canada's "human rights commissions" a slogan:

"We may disapprove of what you say – and if we do we'll make you pay."

No, it's not entirely original, but it does have the virtue of being true. In recent months Maclean's magazine has been hauled before two such commissions. Their offense was to print an excerpt from Mark Steyn's book "America Alone."

This led Mohamed El-masry, an Egyptian-born Canadian professor and imam who has said that any adult Jew in Israel is a legitimate target of terrorist attack, to file a complaint against the magazine. The case is still pending.

Now Ezra Levant, former publisher of the defunct Western Standard magazine, faces similar persecution. His sin was to reprint the Danish cartoons that in 2006 prompted crowds of angry Muslims to torch embassies hither and yon.

A complaint against Levant was filed by the head of the Islamic Supreme Council of Canada, and he potentially faces stiff fines and the indignity of being compelled to apologize.

Isn't it fine to live in the West, where everybody has a right to free speech?

-- *National Review*, Feb. 11 issue. Reprinted by the *New York Post* Jan. 30, 2008

### **"To Serve and Protect" Ohio Style**

Robin Garrison was walking in Berliner Park in Columbus, Ohio, when he saw a woman sunbathing topless.

They started talking and getting comfortable, the woman smiling and resting her foot on his shoulder at one point. Eventually, she asked to see Garrison's penis; he complied.

Seconds later, undercover police officers charged him with public indecency.

While topless sunbathing is legal in the city's parks, exposing more than that is against the law.

Garrison's attorney argued that it was a case of entrapment.

The argument failed to sway a Franklin County Municipal Court jury that found Garrison guilty. He was ordered to stay away from the park,

placed on a year's probation and fined \$250.

### **New York Style**

In New York City, nearly 300 people, many of whom had no criminal record, have been snared through the NYPD's Operation Lucky Bag, in which undercover officers leave a wallet, iPod or cell phone in a subway station and wait to see who picks it up.

"[T]his is a police-created crime," said Legal Aid Society lawyer Alex Lesman, who defended a man arrested for taking a bag containing a cell phone and cash. "The police shouldn't be luring people."

The judge acquitted Lesman's client, Antonio Arroyo. "The police should concentrate their noble efforts on countering real crimes," wrote Kings County criminal court judge Matthew A. Sciarrino Jr. --

<http://abcnews.go.com/TheLaw/story?id=4022717>, Dec. 27, 2007

### **Tax Time, Scare Time**

OCALA, Fla. (AP) - Action star Wesley Snipes was found not guilty of federal tax-fraud and conspiracy charges Friday, but was convicted on three misdemeanor counts of failing to file a tax return.

Snipes was also indicted on six counts of willful failure to file from 1999-2004. He was acquitted on three of those and convicted on the others. He could be sentenced to three years in prison after originally facing a possible 16 years.

Snipes' lawyers argued that he was a victim of crooked advisers, and the jury seemed to believe it. Co-defendants Eddie Ray Kahn, the founder of a tax protest group, and Douglas P. Rosile, an accountant who lost his licenses, were convicted Friday by the same panel of tax fraud and conspiracy. Both face up to 10 years in prison.

The verdict came on the third full day of deliberations.

Snipes, who starred in the "Blade" films and "White Men Can't Jump," is among the most famous targets of an IRS criminal investigation, and his prosecution was key for the government. The actor used tax protest arguments long rejected by courts but still continuing to find adherents.

For example, Snipes said the IRS's own code meant no citizen had to pay taxes on income earned in this country, and the agency had no legal authority to collect wages anyway, because it is not a proper government entity.

Snipes' attorneys claimed he tried for years to get the IRS to explain whether he owed taxes. Later, the actor threatened the government and individual agents in his pursuit, declaring himself a "nonresident alien" not subject to tax laws.

In a yearlong battle with the IRS, Snipes drew on the dubious "861 argument." So named because it refers to Section 861 of the tax code, the law holds that foreign-source wages of U.S. citizens are taxable. But tax protesters take that to mean only such income is subject to tax, and no wages made in this country are.

Judge and jury have long rejected those ideas, but there are exceptions. A few have won acquittal because the jury thought they sincerely believed they did not have to pay taxes.

The IRS bears a unique burden of proof in criminal tax cases. The agency must show not only that someone broke the law, but he or she did so with willful, bad purpose to defraud the government.

-- AP, Feb. 1, 2008

### **Justice Loses 4th Case against Tax Deniers**

Even as Congress has reduced income tax rates, the tax denier movement has spread, fueled by high payroll taxes, political attacks on the Internal Revenue Service and anger among people who have not benefited from decades of strong overall economic growth.

Instead of prosecuting all offenders, the Justice Department brings cases against well-known individuals, hoping that widespread news coverage will encourage compliance, a policy known as general deterrence.

Tax deniers assert variously that the tax laws are valid but do not apply to them, that no law makes anyone liable for taxes and that the government tricks people into paying. Promoters of tax denial claim that people can legally stop paying income taxes by executing certain documents, or by not signing others, such as tax returns. Courts have rejected all of these arguments.

JJ MacNab, a Maryland insurance analyst attended Snipes' trial and is writing a book about tax deniers. Last year Congress passed a law drafted by Ms. MacNab empowering the Internal Revenue Service to impose \$5,000 fines on people who assert tax denier claims not just in court, but also in papers sent to the agency. The law gives tax deniers one opportunity to

withdraw the papers after the agency sends them a list of tax denier theories rejected by the courts.

The Snipes case is the fourth significant loss by Justice Department prosecutors who brought felony charges against people who were leading figures in the tax denier movement.  
-- NY Times, Feb. 1, 2008

## Showdown at the Matricula Consular corral

Matricula Consular cards are identification cards issued by the Mexican government to mainly illegal immigrants living in the United States. Currently, more than 350 financial institutions accept Matricula Consular cards as proof of identification thereby allowing thousands of illegal immigrants to have access to mainstream U.S. financial services.

The Santa Ana, CA, Mexican Consulate set up a mobile Mexican Matricula Consular ID center on UNITED STATES PUBLIC SCHOOL PROPERTY - Capistrano School District at the Adult English Language Development Center located at 31351 Camino Real, San Juan Capistrano, CA.

When the Minutemen arrived at the Capistrano School District Adult School there was a hub of activity. A mobile Mexican Consulate center was in full swing.

After the Minutemen had been onsite for about an hour and a half, the mobile center was shut down when Minutemen began to observe and report, documenting and photographing. The Mexican Nationals no longer ventured forth to the center and many, who had been in attendance, left the mobile center.

A Mexican diplomat, above photo, approached the Minutemen as the Minutemen were peacefully strolling about- on United States public school property - observing and taking photos of the event. She would not give us her business card nor her name.

The Mexican diplomat repeatedly said, "This a private event for Mexicans only. You cannot be here I am telling you nicely as I do not want to call the police. Please leave."

BUT we were ON UNITED STATES PROPERTY - WHERE U. S. CITIZENS HAVE THE RIGHT TO BE ... AND THE MEXICAN HAS NO AUTHORITY TO ORDER CITIZENS AROUND!!!!

Minuteman Project National Rally Spokesman Raymond Herrera said to the Mexican diplomat, "No, we will not leave. We are guaranteed

freedom of assembly under OUR Constitution."

The Mexican diplomat was particularly vexed by our photographing of the event. "DO NOT TAKE PHOTOS," she commanded repeatedly.

Minutemen stated that in the USA, we have the right to photograph in public.

"No, you cannot take photos," she insisted. Herrera and the diplomat then entered into a lengthy discussion in Spanish.

The man, above photo, displayed gang hand signals and yelled out "THIS IS OUR TERRITORY!"

The Mexican diplomat witnessed and seemingly approved of the gang member at the "Mexican Only" event.

He appeared to be filling out an application - in his left hand above. Many have informally been told that in the Hispanic community only gang members wear black shoes. Note in the photo above, the only man in black shoes is the self-professed gang member.

The Minutewoman, above, holding the Stop Illegal Immigration sign, had been quietly photographing... Suddenly the door above opened, and the Mexican diplomat, came out yelling. The photo above is just before she lashed out.

To our utter amazement, the diplomat started to strike out at the Minutewoman! We were in a state of shock. As she yelled, she struck across the Minutewoman's lower right jaw and lip, several times.

The Minutewoman above, used her sign as a shield, while pulling her camera back from the assaulting Mexican diplomat. Ten minutes after the assault the Minutewoman still had a "stinging" sensation on her lip and jaw area.

Police [Orange County sheriff's officers] arrived after the assault.

The police said they had been called by the consulate as they had reported that the Minutemen were inside the building yelling and pushing about. We never entered the building and had been quietly moving outside, on school property.

Herrera spoke with officers then requested they interview the diplomat.

Per the officer's request, the diplomat came forward.

"They must leave," she said to the officer. But the officer replied, "No, this is a public school and they can be here."

The diplomat then said that we must stop photographing them.

"Ma'am," the officer informed her, "You are in a public area and they can photograph."

The officer then asked her, "Do you have the paperwork to use this facility."

"Yes," she replied.

"I would like to see it," the officer said.

"I don't have the paperwork with me," she said back to him.

"I would like to see your identification," the officer said.

"No, you can't," she said to the officer. The officer at this point followed her inside of the building.

"I have no identification with me. I did not drive," she finally said as the officer pursued the issue. At this point, the door shut and the officer remained inside of the building.

After the officer spoke with the diplomat, he returned to his vehicle and spoke on his cell phone for about 15 to 20 minutes.

After he hung up, he met with us. He said the consulate did not have paperwork but that he had spoken to the individual who had granted the use of the school. He said that we could continue to assemble on the school property.

He appeared sympathetic about the Minutewoman assault, but said the Mexican Consulate staff had diplomatic immunity.

The Consul license plate on the diplomat's Nissan is C KS1947.

Call Adult Education - San Juan Capistrano School District 949-489-7445.

Express your stance on the issue of the Mexican Consulate's mobile matricula consular ID center and a Mexican diplomat assaulting an American woman on U.S. public school property.

-- San Juan Capistrano, Dec. 9, 2007

## Acting ATF Director's ties to gun control groups

It should not surprise anyone that anti-gun Sen. John Kerry demands that Senators Crapo, Craig and Vitter remove their holds from Acting ATF Director Michael J. Sullivan's confirmation. Kerry even states, "*He's the farthest thing from an ideologue that you could imagine*," but he then goes on to say "*I share with the administration real concern that a decent and professional law enforcement officer's nomination is in jeopardy*."

"Maximum Mike" Sullivan in April 2007 touted the ATF's "outstanding



relationship" with the International Associations of Chiefs of Police. An organization that has been exposed by the NRA as being in the pockets of a large gun control group. Fitting enough Acting ATF Director Michael J. Sullivan was one of the Keynote Speakers at IACP's Great Lakes States Summit on Gun Violence. Sullivan also served on a panel that included gun banners Chicago Mayor Richard Daley, Joyce Foundation President Ellen Alberding, Milwaukee Mayor Tom Barrett and Prof. David Hemerway.

So who else was there? Only a who's who of anti-gun organizations such as: Brady Center to Prevent gun violence, New England Coalition to Prevent Gun Violence, John Hopkins Center for Gun Policy and Research, Iowans for the Prevention of Gun Violence, Violence Prevention Research Program, Legal Community Against Violence, Illinois Violent Death Reporting System, Task Force on Family Violence, Illinois Council Against Handgun Violence, Indiana Partnership to Prevent Violent Injury and Death, Iowans for the Prevention of Gun Violence, Ohio Coalition Against Gun Violence, Center for Firearm Injury, Citizens for a Safer Minnesota, The Joyce Foundation, PAX/Real Solutions to Gun Violence, Violence Policy Center.

No wonder Sullivan's friend Sen. Ted Kennedy stated, *"We'll miss him in Massachusetts, but he'll be a strong leader at ATF, and I look forward to working with him on key issues on gun control."*

"Maximum Mike" has shown his true colors and every gun owner needs to contact their Senator to oppose Sullivan's confirmation. And any of my Republican friends who say..."but he's a Republican"; my answer to that is...So is Brady Campaign President Paul Helmke! -- redstradingpost.blogspot.com, Jan. 29, 2008

### Follow the Money

By Chris Cox

I'm going to describe a group that recently demanded enactment of a

sweeping federal gun control agenda.

Let's see if you can guess who it is.

The group has 22,000 members in more than 100 countries. Membership categories include "city managers, highway safety specialists, psychologists, attorneys, coroners and management analysts," among others. The group has offices in Europe and the Caribbean, and the group's website describes its governing board in your choice of English, Spanish, Portuguese and French.

Is it a new United Nations disarmament agency? No, the group is the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP), headquartered in the nation's capital.

The IACP report, called "Taking a Stand: Reducing Gun Violence in Our Communities," is nothing more than a rubber stamp of the pre-existing blueprint the enemies of freedom plan to pursue after the 2008 elections--if they win total control of the White House and Congress.

What compelled the IACP to issue this sweeping report? Follow the money. A note on the cover proudly declares that the report was issued "with support from the Joyce Foundation."

That's a familiar name to longtime readers. The Joyce Foundation has pumped tens of millions of dollars into the coffers of gun ban groups. The Violence Policy Center, an unashamed promoter of a total ban on handguns, collected more than \$1 million of Joyce money just in 2005 and 2006. In 2000, the Joyce Foundation paid a VPC advisor and former Handgun Control, Inc. board member to edit a "Second Amendment Symposium" issue of the Chicago-Kent Law Review. That slim volume contains nearly half the anti-individual rights articles ever published on the Second Amendment.

The IACP newsletter proudly notes that the Joyce Foundation has "made more than \$30 million in grants to groups seeking public health solutions that offer the promise of reducing gun deaths and injuries in America."

This year, the Joyce Foundation paid IACP over \$500,000 to

host "The Great Lakes States Summit on Gun Violence," and then to issue the report from the conference. The Joyce Foundation got what it paid for-- the report thanks Joyce Foundation Communications Director Mary O'Connell for "her editing, writing and consistent work to produce this report."

Every word, every concept, every "recommendation" of the IACP report would, in practice, drive a wedge between peaceable citizens and their police departments, and more importantly, their police officers.

Americans support their law enforcement officers because they know that they can trust them. But IACP, in its partnership with the worst of the gun-ban crowd, is telling police departments to betray that trust and to turn on their citizens--as a matter of policy.

I am proud of my years of service as a police officer. But I have to tell you, what IACP is attempting to do is very bad for American law enforcement. IACP is trying to divide America's law enforcement officers from the very people they serve. But they forget that America's cops represent all of the people, and know that they must have the trust of the people to do their jobs. After all, at the end of the day, America's law officers are just a part of the rest of society.

What IACP is saying is that they don't trust law-abiding citizens. It mirrors the paranoid political philosophy that drives the Violence Policy Center, the Brady Campaign and NYC Mayor Bloomberg's cadre of power-hungry, big-city politicians.

They don't trust ordinary law-abiding citizens. To put it simply, they don't trust you.

I ask a rhetorical question. If someone doesn't trust you as a matter of course, should you trust them?

-- NRA-ILA, posted Nov. 15, 2007

"Liberty cannot be preserved without general knowledge among the people. Let us dare to read, think, speak and write." --John Adams, August, 1765

### NJM, P.O. Box 10176, Trenton New Jersey 08650

ISSN 1523-4657

[www.njmilitia.org](http://www.njmilitia.org)

[info@njmilitia.org](mailto:info@njmilitia.org)

[walnor@keepandbeararms.com](mailto:walnor@keepandbeararms.com)

Middlesex County, Art (732) 607-0833

Morris County, Bill (973) 361-3241

Johnson County, TX, Earl (817) 783-2375

### Newsletter Subscription - Donation \$10.00

Cash or Blank Money Order Only

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_